DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 280 HE 006 678

TITLE Expanding Opportunity Through Sharing Faculty Resources.
INSTITUTION Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga. Inst. for Higher Educational Opportunity.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 24p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Consortia; *Cooperative Planning; Cooperative Programs; Coordination; *Educational Facilities; Facilities; Faculty; *Higher Education; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; Resources; Shared Services

ABSTRACT

The practice of utilizing faculty resources across institutional lines is not new. At the present time there is an increasing awareness of the opportunity for expanding the interinstitutional utilization of faculty between the historically black campuses and the historically white campuses that are located in proximity to each other. In the process of state planning to eliminate dualism in public higher education, the geographic proximity is often regarded as constituting a difficult problem calling for the review of institutional roles and responsibilities. On the other hand, their proximity offers an opportunity for providing, through cooperation and joint planning, a combined resource for serving the total community in its increasing efforts to serve all ethnic groups without discrimination. This report is a compilation of discussions with administrators and faculty from locations where steps to initiate joint planning have been taken. The materials from these discussions are presented under four headings: the potential benefits which may result from interinstitutional utilization of faculty resources; barriers to achieving cooperative programs; types of arrangements that may be developed between institutions; and suggestions for planning procedures. (Author/JMF)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED111280

EXPANDING OPPORTUNITY THROUGH SHARING FACULTY RESOURCES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

HE 006 678

Southern Regional Education Board

EXPANDING OPPORTUNITY THROUGH SHARING FACULTY RESOURCES

Institute for Higher Educational Opportunity
Southern Regional Education Board
1975

3

FOREWORD

Following the Supreme Court ruling of 1954, and especially following the 1964 Civil Rights Act, access to postsecondary educational institutions is no longer determined by ethnic origin. Further court decisions and actions by federal agencies have resulted in affirmative action planning to achieve "unitary systems" in public higher education. Private institutions are also expected to respond to requirements for visible efforts to desegregate their campuses both in employment and in composition of student body. In the public sector the proximity of two institutions of differing historical backgrounds raises questions of duplication of offerings. As a consequence both states and institutions have for some years engaged in state planning which includes a review of roles and responsibilities of public universities and colleges.

In 1967 the Southern Regional Education Board adopted a Position Statement which stressed the importance of adopting plans which are both educationally and operationally sound. Such arbitrary procedures as moving faculty or students to different campuses merely to achieve higher percentages of ethnic diversity may result in poorer instruction and less opportunity. The desegregation process is more than a "numbers game" and, to be effective, calls for educational statesmanship. This point is of critical importance in projecting future roles for institutions in the same locality which have traditionally served different ethnic populations.

Proximity should not be regarded as a problem but rather as a potential for serving the total community. For example, with support from the Emergency School Assistance Act, the Southern Regional Education Board worked with historically black and historically white public universities in three locations in the South where they joined forces to provide joint seminars for seniors who were enrolled in student teaching. Even this modest effort produced a graduating class from each institution better qualified to enter today's classrooms.

The same principle is applicable to other academic fields: undergraduate and graduate social work, health professions, business administration, public affairs and urban affairs.

The purpose of this document is to provide suggestions for interinstitutional planning

through which faculty resources of two or more institutions in the same locality may be mobilized to serve the total community. These suggestions were secured through discussions with persons from universities which are examining the possibilities for interinstitutional involvement of faculty. During these conversations the dangers in joint planning were identified as well as the potentials. An essential ingredient in joint planning was found to be a candid review of negative factors, for only in this manner can solutions to problems be reached. The following participated in discussions, one group in Nashville, another in Atlanta, and the last in Greensboro.

Nashville: Dean Jack Allen, George Peabody College
Provost Nicholas Hobbs, Vanderbilt University
Dean Oscar Woolfolk, Fisk University

Atlanta: Dean Thomas H. Byers, Savannah State College
Dean H. Dean Propst, Armstrong College
Executive Vice President Bernhard Sliger, Florida State University
Vice President Gertrude Simmons, Florida A and M University
Barbara Tuckman, Florida State University

Greensboro: Vice Chancellor Stanley L. Jones, University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Dean Edward C. Kollmann, Hampton Institute
Vice Chancellor Glenn F. Rankin North Carolina A and T University

James M. Godard and Samuel E. Cary of the SREB staff were also participants.

Dr. Jesse A. Morris, Director of the Division of Agriculture and Applied Sciences at Alcorn State University, provided a description of the cooperative use of faculty between that institution and Mississippi State University in the field of agriculture. In addition, many other individuals provided suggestions which are reflected in this document. To all of these contributors SREB expresses its appreciation.

Winfred L. Godwin
President
Southern Regional Education Board

5

INTRODUCTION

The practice of utilizing faculty resources across institutional lines is not new. Through inter-institutional arrangements and consortia, colleges and universities have been able to provide students with wider opportunities in specialized areas of instruction than would have been feasible on one campus. The Southern Regional Education Board has assisted in the execution of such agreements across state lines, and its Academic Common Market program is a recent development of this nature.

At the present time there is an increasing awareness of the opportunity for expanding the interinstitutional utilization of faculty between the historically black campuses and the historically white campuses which are located in proximity to each other. Many of the public universities which traditionally served different ethnic groups are located in the same cities.* In the process of state planning to eliminate dualism in public higher education, the geographic proximity is often regarded as constituting a difficult problem calling for the review of institutional roles and responsibilities. On the other hand, their proximity offers an opportunity for providing, through cooperation and joint planning, a combined resource for serving the total community in its increasing efforts to serve all ethnic groups without discrimination.

Although there are many benefits to be gained through interinstitutional utilization of faculty resources, many barriers to joint planning exist. They are deeply rooted in past history and in concerns related to the future. Too often, in preliminary attempts to consider joint programs, these barriers have not been identified but have remained beneath the surface. On the other hand, when they become visible and are candidly reviewed, discussions have sometimes progressed to the identification of constructive arrangements for cooperative instructional activities.

In the preparation of this report, SREB staff consulted with administrators and faculty from locations where steps to initiate joint planning

*Examples may be found in Baltimore, Norfolk, Greensboro, Tallahassee, Savannah, Montgomery, Huntsville, New Orleans, Baton Rouge, Houston and Nashville, as well as in locations in neighboring communities such as Ruston and Grambling in Louisiana.

have been initiated. The materials from these discussions are presented under four headings: the potential benefits which may result from inter-institutional utilization of faculty resources; barriers to achieving cooperative programs; types of arrangements which may be developed between institutions, and suggestions for planning procedures.

BENEFITS

The discussion in Greensboro on March 10-11, 1975, opened with this question: "Why should North Carolina A and T University and the University of North Carolina in Greensboro undertake joint planning?" Dr. Stanley Jones, vice chancellor for academic affairs at U.N.C., Greensboro, perhaps identified the most important reason of all. He said that the *first* reason is "the fact that we share a community, a growing constituency, and that our institutions have many complementary programs. We share that community with four other institutions in Guilford County, and three of these are in Greensboro. The possibilities exist, looking at it selfishly for my own institution, of increasing the opportunities for our students to have more classroom intellectual experiences, for the faculty to have broader access to resources for instruction, and for all of these institutions to serve more satisfactorily the needs of this community. That's where it is." Indeed, that is "where it is." The greatest benefit comes to the total community and the constituency served by the institutions. This goal is the ultimate one and outweighs the more specific benefits to the institutions.

Major benefits to be derived from interinstitutional utilization of faculty resources are listed below as stated by participants in the conferences held in Nashville, Atlanta, and Greensboro. In some cases one will seem to duplicate another, but the language used may reflect nuances of meaning which should not be lost.

1. Students, faculty, and the community will have access to a greater variety of academic resources.
2. Students will have a greater variety and range of educational experiences.
3. Academic programs may be developed which could not or would not be developed by a single institution.
4. Through cooperation institutions may build expertise in specific areas without being forced to spread their resources too thin to give broad academic coverage.
5. Joint planning promotes better understanding of higher education needs and problems in the entire community and, subsequently, results in a concerted effort to meet those needs and to solve those problems.
6. The cooperation that is required to effect such sharing promotes mutual awareness of the other college's potential and a mutual respect for its capabilities.
7. Interinstitutional sharing should promote fuller utilization of currently underutilized specialities of faculty at both institutions.
8. Students, faculty, and the community will experience inter-racial activity on a positive working level.
9. Joint faculty workshops, in-service training seminars, symposia, retreats, and other collective efforts will improve communication and understanding and open up ways to strengthen curricula and delivery systems.
10. The sharing of resources can help to dispel the myth of superior white instruction and of inferior black instruction.
11. For the white faculty member of a white college, participation in programs at a black college should increase his understanding of what it is like to be a member of a minority.
12. The public association of faculty members on an equal basis should enhance the self-image of black students (on both campuses) and increase the white student's awareness and appreciation of the capabilities of blacks.
13. The image of the black college will be

improved in the white community, and the image of the white college will be improved in the black community.

14. Faculty members, sharing their teaching strategies and research interests, may be stimulated to try new approaches in their instructional procedures.
15. Intellectual growth among faculty members is developed. Faculty members are helped to grow intellectually through contacts with their colleagues at "other race" institutions.
16. The program will help institutions diversify the ethnic composition of the faculty without "raiding" the neighboring institution's teaching staff.
17. Multi-ethnic experiences are made a part of the lives of students and faculty as well as other members of the academic community.
18. Cooperative planning gives a more comprehensive meaning to education and helps to democratize its base by joining the cognitive, the affective, and the creative in all spheres of human endeavor, thus making the postsecondary experience more than a meeting of minds in the abstract sense.
19. The economic threat to the private institutions can be reduced through the sharing of resources without the loss of identity of the institutions involved in the program.
20. Through access to instructional resources such as libraries and laboratories, the strengths of individual institutions are enhanced.
21. State-supported schools can become *mutually* supportive of efforts to acquire resources for program development.

NEGATIVE FACTORS AND PROBLEMS

In listing negative factors related to cooperative planning, the conference participants were not regarding them as arguments against joint planning. On the contrary, they believe that these factors must be identified and confronted in a forthright manner. The procedures for resolving these questions are not always clear. Nor will all suggested steps be applicable to each situation. The major concern is that issues such as these be faced, defined, and related to the procedures which are established to achieve cooperative planning.

1. The perceptions of unique constituencies, such as alumni and special public groups, are particularly sensitive factors. How may a community effort be achieved without loss, or apparent loss, of individual institutional identity and uniqueness?
2. Closely related to (1) above is the tendency of the press and other media to emphasize what seem to be the more newsworthy instances of success. The real objectives and achievements can easily be obscured by this process. It is important that institutions involved in this process watch carefully to secure the involvement of all parties from all institutions concerned when it is known that news stories are being prepared. When misleading news stories are published, administrators of the institutions involved must take care to get correct information to their constituencies at once.
3. To avoid the "big brother" approach, which will be self-defeating, there must be openly and equally arrived at covenants for joint planning.
4. Absence of visible, firm, and clear commitments by governing bodies and top administrators to joint planning often dooms the project before it is undertaken.
5. Failure to involve faculty in joint planning at the earliest time will result in opposition to suggested programs.
6. Leadership at the highest level (e.g., legislatures, boards of regents, presidents,

chancellors) must emphasize constantly that cooperation does not imply or lead to merger, but that cooperation if fully implemented can be an alternative to forced merger.

7. Psychological barriers between institutions generate attitudes which result in defensive planning to avoid cooperation.
8. Fear that cooperation will weaken a department's plans for the future may cause opposition.
9. Basing cooperation primarily on federal requirements for compliance distracts attention from potential educational gains which may result.
10. Too much attention to "stereotypes" of what the black college may contribute, such as Black Studies or Fine Arts, may engender a negative attitude toward cooperation.
11. Leaders in white institutions may think that black students attend black colleges for economic reasons or for factors other than the ethnic choice.
12. Poor selection of faculty for "other campus" teaching may in the early stages destroy a program.
13. Failure to recognize that ethnic pluralism may be a more realistic objective today than integration in the ideal sense may stand in the way of cooperative planning.

TYPES OF ARRANGEMENTS

Arrangements for interinstitutional use of faculty may range from mere permissiveness through a variety of internal agreements to formal arrangements—and even ultimately to joint departmental programs.

Permissiveness

"Moonlighting" in which a faculty member from one institution teaches in another without any formal agreement between the institutions is a common practice in some locations. It usually

results in an overload for that faculty member, about which he will not complain because of the extra income he receives. This practice may be acceptable for meeting emergency situations, but it will not lead to the benefit described earlier. If carried too far, this procedure may have a negative effect on the quality of instruction.

Informal Arrangements

Two institutions in proximity may formulate and adopt a general agreement which provides student access to courses on the other campus, or through which instructional departments may employ faculty from the other institution to teach a course, or for both. In Greensboro, for example, the four colleges and universities permit a student to take a course on another campus provided that 1) the course is not being offered at that time on his own campus; 2) there is space for him, and 3) his dean signs an approval form. No charge is made either to the student or to the college in which he is matriculated, and his grade and credit are automatically transferred to his own institution.

In another location, the services of Professor X are secured to teach one course on the other campus in an agreement by which his load on his own campus is reduced and the other university reimburses his institution for this service. Arrangements of this nature may be beneficial by making maximum use of a highly specialized faculty member or of a faculty person who has a significant contribution to make to two campuses.

Formal Agreements

When two institutions wish to establish a long-term cooperative arrangement, a formal agreement is structured which defines in some detail the specific points involved in the plan. An illustration from Greensboro indicates the difference between a broad general arrangement for access and a specific plan involving both institutions in a joint effort on a long-term basis. The two public universities have combined their supervision of the intern experience of students in the undergraduate social work curriculum. The faculties of both institutions worked out the details, and the social agencies were consulted in the formation of the agreement. The results are, of course, beneficial to the community agencies as well as to the student interns. The undergraduate social work program is now strengthened by the deeper ethnical dimensions to the training program.

The formal arrangement may provide results of broader significance than the informal. In the formal agreement provision may be made for the faculty member teaching on two campuses to contribute to departmental planning and development in the institution were he is the visiting teacher, extending his contribution beyond his classroom performance.

The creation of a joint professorship between two universities may provide an appropriate method of utilizing the talents of a faculty person highly trained in a specialized field. This arrangement is also appropriate as a means of strengthening interinstitutional planning.

Armstrong College and Savannah State College provide an illustration of a formal agreement which combines two instructional departments in a joint program for the Master of Education degree. Each candidate must take a certain number of courses on the campus of the other institution, and each college has assumed responsibility for certain courses. The administrative supervision is provided by one institution for two years and is then moved to the other for a similar period. The cooperation is symbolized by a joint commencement, and the diploma bears the name of both institutions. The community and the public school system benefit through the experiences which teachers have relevant to teaching in the multi-ethnic school system. Yet the plan provides for the continued identity of each institution without threat to the continuity of its existence and its significance.

In another location consideration is being given to establishing a joint master's degree program in nursing. Whatever the outcome may be, the resources of both institutions will be utilized in a manner which will strengthen the instruction.

At the conferences convened by SREB there were differences of judgment on whether it is easier to start with informal or formal agreements. The informal approach makes it possible for faculty members to know each other, to develop mutual respect, and to move to more formal arrangements with confidence and assurance. On the other hand, the formal agreement may achieve significant results more quickly and has the advantage, if the planning is properly done, of resolving potential disagreements and misunderstandings which may occur under informal and undefined relationships.

SUGGESTION FOR PLANNING

The general setting in which the planning process takes place will substantially influence the degree of progress achieved. The clarity with which goals are defined, and their acceptance by both institutions, are also important factors. Experience has indicated that the following goals are usually negative in their impact:

1. *Planning based primarily on the goal of achieving compliance to civil rights requirements.* While this reason has often initiated cooperative planning programs, the most significant results are achieved only when this motive become secondary. If it remains primary, the emphasis is placed upon arriving at numerical outcomes in increased ethnical diversity on each campus rather than upon devising meaningful improvements in instruction.
2. *Planning based primarily on reducing instructional costs.* Although there may be some reduction in costs through inter-institutional use of resources, the hope of substantial savings is illusory and, if made a primary goal, will deflect planning from its central purpose of enhancing the quality of instruction.
3. *Planning as a step toward ultimate merger of institutions.* If merger is even implied as a potential outcome, the planning process may become primarily defensive and negative. The conference participants felt that planning should be based on the assumption that effective cooperation is an alternative to a possible merger.

What goals will form a sound basis for joint planning efforts? They are goals which are educationally meaningful, which relate to the fundamental purposes of institutions of higher learning, and which are responsive to contemporary needs both of students and society.

1. *Joint planning to serve the total society.* Universities which have historically served different ethnic groups in a given geographical area can now more effectively serve the total society through cooperative planning. The very differences in the past experiences and histories now constitute a potential resource, if properly

related to each other, for providing educational programs responsive to a pluralistic social structure.

2. *Joint planning to improve instruction.* Planning which provides access for students to the particular strengths of two or more institutions enhances instruction and increases the utilization of specialized talents of faculty. The range of curricular offerings may be expanded, and the quality of classroom instruction may be improved.
3. *Joint planning as an equal partnership.* Planning must be based on a conviction that *each* participating institution has resources of value to the other and on a premise that there will be equal participation in the planning process at every stage of development.

The participants in the discussions held in Nashville, Atlanta, and Greensboro provided many specific suggestions concerning the planning process. In most cases these ideas are the result of practical experience, and they are included with very little editing since the wording often reflects shades of meaning which are significant. For this reason a given idea may be included more than once to reflect the subtle differences among the participants in their experiences.

Procedure for Establishing Joint Planning

1. There is an absolute need for commitments from governing boards to presidents. The chief academic officers, working under a mandate, must have clearly delegated authority to develop and implement plans.
2. All planning must be undergirded by the authority of the top administrative structure. The commitment to carry out the arrangement must be clear and definite so that there is no question in the minds of all concerned that it is not a question of whether or not the task will be accomplished, but rather a question of how and when it will be done.
3. Presidents/chancellors of all institutions involved must give clear evidence of support at the beginning and on a continuing basis. *Evidence of this support must be continually renewed.*
4. Structures for planning and implementa-

tion must reflect institutional realities and must be amenable to change as institutional circumstances and perceptions change.

5. Goals which override narrow individual institutional objectives must be identified, e.g.:
   - student growth and development;
   - community growth and development;
   - development of unique intellectual instructional resources for the local community, the state, the region, and in national/international terms.
6. The institutions immediately involved in joint planning and implementation must maintain an awareness of the impact of their work on other colleges in the community and must look to the involvement of those institutions at appropriate times. If the community becomes supportive, more can be achieved faster and on a permanent basis.
7. Setting up effective interinstitutional utilization of faculty involves several steps:
   - commitment of the governing board and of chief administrative officers to the concept;
   - careful planning of the program by joint faculty groups;
   - education of faculty and students concerning the benefits of the program;
   - establishment of effective lines of communication between faculties;
   - careful selection of the faculty participants for the program;
   - involvement of faculty participants in the academic community of the other institution into which he moves;
   - careful and on-going evaluation of the success of participants in the program;
   - orientation of participants to deal with different procedures at the institution into which they move.
8. Whatever plans are initially drawn, it is essential that these be understood by both participating institutions and that procedures, etc., be published *before* the plans are implemented.
9. Two threats must be directly addressed, whether these threats are real or not — the threat that white institutions will

devour black institutions and the idea that non-white instruction is inferior instruction.

10. Planning must be done by interinstitutional committees or task forces. All members, or at least a quorum from each institution, must be present when decisions are made, and care should be taken to avoid any impression that important matters are decided in caucuses held privately on either campus.
11. Planners must be protected from political or newspaper pressures. They need to know that their work has the endorsement of the administration and that they are not subject to the harassment of outside elements as they try to arrive at decisions which will be in the interest of the region.
12. The planning should be accompanied by a schedule of dates when interinstitutional committees are to report and by assurance that committees will meet repeatedly and not attempt to arrive at solutions in one or two sessions.
13. Faculty members and students must be involved at every stage, from initiation through implementation.
14. Structures for planning must provide for faculty, students, and administrative interaction throughout the process at strategic points where initiation and implementation are occurring.
15. Planning must emphasize the positive aspects of the situation and focus on objectives — no matter how limited — capable of early achievement with a minimum of negativism and tension. It is important that participants be able to point to early successes, no matter how limited they may appear in terms of longer perspectives.
16. It is important to have rules and guidelines, but the greatest care must be taken that they not appear to be unnecessarily limiting or burdensome. Interinstitutional cooperation often requires imaginative administrative entrepreneurship, and the general posture of guidelines and regulations ought to be to encourage and not discourage daring innovation. Also, excessive regulation will appear to reflect fear or hesitancies which may not in truth exist.

17. The leadership at both institutions must stress the fact that any plan must be a plan for strengthening the total institution and that the claims of any of the parts yield to the "grand design."
18. The costs of interinstitutional planning should be projected, and the administration should be prepared to bear any additional expenses which may be incurred in implementing some parts of the plans.
19. An organizational structure and a set of guidelines should be established which are flexible and subject to change if they prove to be a hindrance rather than a facilitating factor.
20. Past experience indicates that there is often difficulty for participants from the two institutions to be honest with one another, and excessive politeness may actually constitute a handicap to thorough review and projection of programs.
21. Lines of communication should follow lines of authority: governing boards to presidents or chancellors, presidents to academic vice presidents, vice presidents to deans, and deans to faculty committees and planning bodies.
22. In some situations it is apparent that it is easier to start a cooperative program at the graduate level or in a highly specialized academic area at the undergraduate level or to start a completely new program which might not otherwise exist at either institution.
23. Experience also suggests that progress is facilitated by taking small steps which are successful before attempting to take large steps.
24. Outside consultants are more helpful after a planning group has made progress and has identified specific problems on which it needs advice.
25. If the program of cooperation includes movement of students between campuses, there should be a person on each campus who serves an "ombudsman" or informal advisory role to whom "other campus" students may go for assistance.
26. Joint planning must include provision for job security of the faculty member who teaches on two campuses; in most

cases this step is accomplished by retention of his tenure status on his original campus.

27. In the case of public institutions, the application of a "formula" for providing state support must be adjusted so that neither institution is penalized financially because of the cooperative arrangements.
28. The establishment of joint research programs is especially significant because the efforts are compellingly visible to everyone in the university community.
29. The use of non-traditional teaching methods as a part of joint instructional programs, such as seminars which meet for two or three hours once a week, independent study, team teaching, and other departures are often of both pedagogical and practical value in arranging schedules.
30. For the person who is going to teach on the other campus, a period of observation of classes there in the term prior to his assignment could be highly beneficial.

Although the central focus of this document is upon joint use of faculty resources by neighboring institutions, this type of cooperation may be executed between campuses at some distance from each other. Many of the suggestions which have been listed may be applied to these arrangements also. The following case study is included as an addendum to this report. It illustrates how joint research and extension work in agriculture has led to joint instructional activities, even though the participating institutions are some distance apart.

COOPERATION IN AGRICULTURE RESEARCH AND INSTRUCTION

A Case Study

Although Alcorn State University and Mississippi State University are not located in close proximity, the two institutions have developed inter-institutional use of faculty resources in instruction through their cooperative activity in Agricultural Research. The following report of this program has been prepared by Dr. Jesse A. Morris, director of the Division of Agriculture and Applied Sciences at Alcorn State University, and is included as an addendum since it provides suggestions relevant to joint faculty activities between campuses.

Background

In August of 1969, SREB held a conference in Atlanta, Georgia, and invited delegates from the 1890 and the 1862 Land-Grant colleges of several Southern states to discuss the problems of cooperation and coordination. Through face to face dialogue, common problems were discussed and state delegations had an opportunity to exchange meaningful ideas. This conference, coordinated by Dr. T. J. Horne and others from SREB, served as a stimulus to get cooperation and coordination moving in Mississippi between the two agricultural colleges.

It should be noted, however, that prior to the 1969 SREB conference, some thought had been given to the matter of cooperation and coordination. Dr. William Giles, president of Mississippi State University, and Dr. Walter Washington, president of Alcorn College, had talked and discussed the possibility of cooperative ventures between the two institutions. Prior to this, Dr. Louis Wise, vice president of Agriculture and Forestry at Mississippi State University, had discussed the possibility of cooperation in agriculture with former President J. D. Boyd of Alcorn College.

In summary, such progress that has been made in Mississippi can be directly credited to the leadership and foresight of President

Giles, President Washington, and Vice President Wise, which was nurtured and encouraged by the 1969 SREB conference. The following two general statements outline the background of our interinstitutional cooperation in Mississippi.

1. Immediately after the 1969 SREB conference, a coordinating council composed of five persons from Alcorn State University and five persons from Mississippi State University was appointed by the president of each institution. This council meets at regular intervals on the campus of each institution and at the Research and Development Center in Jackson, Mississippi.
2. The coordinating council, with the support of the two institutions, Dr. Horne and SREB, outlined several projects or activities to foster and promote cooperation and coordination in agriculture between the two schools for the benefit of Mississippi. Some of the projected activities were:
   - Alcorn faculty and staff members would be invited to attend and participate in teaching, research, and extension conferences and meetings sponsored by Mississippi State University.
   - Mississippi State University would provide Alcorn with critical teaching aids such as herd sires for beef cattle and swine.
   - A subcommittee of the coordinating council would draw up the plans for a proposed Branch Experiment Station for Alcorn State University.
   - A subcommittee of the coordinating council would make plans for the Alcorn Branch of the Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service.
   - A subcommittee of the council would work out the details for the project use of PL 89-106 research funds in order to insure that the research needs of the state were being met.
   - A subcommittee of the council would prepare a proposal to secure funds for the rural development of Southwest Mississippi and submit the proposal to Rockefeller Foundation for possible funding.
   - The council purported to seek ways

and means of acquiring an airstrip for Alcorn to facilitate the cooperative work between the two schools.

Cooperation in Research

As a result of the work of the Coordinating Council, the 1971 Mississippi Legislature passed a bill creating the Alcorn A & M Branch of the Mississippi Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station (MAFES). This station, the 10th branch of MAFES, is located on the campus of Alcorn State University and is staffed by a superintendent, four scientists, one secretary, and two full-time research technicians. The central thrust of the station is to raise and stabilize the incomes of rural dwellers in southwest Mississippi. Major research projects are conducted in feeder pig production, and fruit and vegetable production.

The PL 89-106 CSRS-United States Department of Agriculture research program is also coordinated through the Alcorn Branch Station. As a matter of fact, the superintendent of the branch station also serves as research coordinator of CSRS funds.

Cooperation in Extension

The Alcorn Branch of the Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service was organized in 1971, and the assistant director of the MCES was assigned the responsibility of working with this branch. Although the branch can work throughout Mississippi, its primary concentration is in t[illegible] southwest Mississippi counties. The mission of the extension branch coincides with that of the experiment station branch, the raising and stabilizing of the incomes of dwellers in southwest Mississippi.

Working through the county extension leaders, and with the use of a specialist and para-professional, the Alcorn branch of the MCES has served as a delivery service for the research branch.

Cooperation in Teaching

The instructional program of Alcorn State University has been strengthened through the cooperative projects that have developed as a result of the Coordinating Council. Both research and extension specialists have been available to teach and lead discussions for extension conferences and workshops.

Each year, the research and extension branches jointly sponsor a field day for rural and urban visitors. In 1974, more than 1700 persons were taught by research and extension scientists at the field day.

Also, the scientists of the Alcorn Branch Experiment Station teach agricultural classes for credit at Alcorn State University. Through an arrangement worked out by the administrators of Alcorn and Mississippi State, the scientists are permitted to teach half-time. This greatly strengthens the instructional program by permitting the research to be related to the instruction and it permits Alcorn State University to provide for more specialization in its instructional program. By having more persons involved in teaching, a higher degree of specialization is attainable. More significant than this, however, is the vast array of research facilities and equipment made possible by the Alcorn Branch Experiment Station which are available for teaching and demonstration. The cooperative research program between Alcorn and Mississippi State University has made this possible.

General Comments

Through the Coordinating Council, tremendous progress has been made in the area of cooperation between Alcorn State University and Mississippi State University. As a matter of fact, all of the long range plans of the Coordinating Council have been completed. The Branch Experiment Station and the branch of the Cooperative Extension Service are now functioning. The Alcorn airstrip has been completed and planes from Mississippi State University now land almost daily. Also, Alcorn staff members now fly to Mississippi State. A grant was secured from the Rockefeller Foundation for rural development work in Southwest Mississippi. The grant conducted jointly by the two institutions was for approximately $400,000 over a four-year period. Also, many of the students and teachers from Alcorn State University are now pursuing graduate studies at Mississippi State University.

In all candor, I believe that what we have achieved in the way of cooperation here in Mississippi has been very significant. However, I do not believe that we would have made this much progress without the full

endorsement and support of the presidents of each institution and the sincere spirit and desire to cooperate which has been exhibited by the vice presidents, deans, directors, department heads, and scientists. Unless all participants are committed to make plans in good faith, no progress will accrue. It is also very important that each institution be permitted to maintain its identity and its usual programs. No one can be expected to plan in good faith if a fear exists that he is planning for the end. On the other hand, much good can be generated and a high degree of cooperation and coodination can be attained when the major objective is the improvement of agricultural instruction, research, and extension in the state by both institutions.

With reference to the possibility that what you now have might expand into other ways of using faculty across institutional lines, my comment would be as follows. We have already involved faculty across institutional lines in all of the traditional land-grant college programs. Our people serve on all of the joint research and extension committees, and participate in all of the various statewide programs. However, should some new ideas or programs evolve, we are prepared to keep an open mind. If the proposal would enable us to improve our mission and at the same time maintain our identity, I would certainly be prepared to present the same to the administration of our institution with a recommendation of approval.